

---

ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum – GNSO - NCSG Policy Committee Meeting  
Monday, March 22, 2021 – 10:30 to 12:00 EST

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Hello, and welcome to the NCSG Policy Committee Meeting. My name is Maryam Bakoshi, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. I'll read questions or comments allowed during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you'd like to ask your question or meet your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor.

Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are don't speak in.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note that this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the Closed Caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I'll hand over the floor to the chair of the NCSG Policy Committee, Tomslin Samme-Nlar.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you. Thank you, Maryam. Welcome, everyone, to our session at ICANN70. And we have a packed agenda today. I hope we can get through

---

**Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.**

---

everything, especially with the agenda of the Council meeting looking very long.

I will start with that item so that we can get through that. Tatiana, if you can help us with that, please.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Yes. So, let's go through the GNSO Council agenda. And I must admit that is a very, very, very packed agenda, so there is a good chance that we will not be able to go through all the agenda items. And it's not clear yet, but there is a good opportunity that we will probably have an extraordinary Council meeting scheduled if we will not go through this entire agenda.

So, let me start with the ... Well, not with the first agenda item, of course, because it's all the administrative matters, and review and amendments to the agenda, and updates to the Statements of Interest.

The second agenda item. Those of you who regularly attend the GNSO Council meeting know that we normally review the focus areas and provide updates to the project list and action item list. And now the project list is quite long, and normally Tomslin updates you on this during the policy calls.

And I will go directly to the agenda item #3 three which is the confirmation of the Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board regarding the adoption of relevant outputs from the PDP on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures. And this is a pretty easy one because, as you might know, at our previous GNSO Council meeting, we approved the report from the working group on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures.

---

And it is the process of the policy development that after the report is approved, the GNSO Council has to send the report to the Board. So, basically this agenda item is just the information that GNSO is sending these recommendations to the Board.

Item #4. I will actually go through this quite briefly because we already had this agenda item at our previous NCSG Policy Committee meeting. It was about the IANA Naming Function Contract Amendment, and I will probably give the floor to Tomslin to explain briefly.

However, we discussed it already during our previous NCSG policy committee meeting because it was, indeed, on the agenda for the GNSO Council meeting in February. However, it turned out that actually, before GNSO can vote on this, we needed the Community input. So, the agenda item was moved from February to March and, together, community input to gather comments so we can vote on it safely.

There was a motion submitted, and Tomslin is the seconder of the motion. So, Tomslin, perhaps I can give you a couple of me is to just say what this motion is about so it wouldn't be only me talking.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Yes, thanks, Tatiana. Maryam, can you just scroll down a little bit so I can remind myself what's on that motion? Yes. I also happened to be the co-chair of this this review team of the IANA Naming Functions contract, and we did we did submit the final report for public comments.

This this particular ... It had about four recommendations, and this particular one required us to seek support from both the ccNSO Council and the GNSO Council, and have a session with the stakeholders from

---

ccNSO and GNSO. We did that in the last ICANN meeting. And also have a session with the Board, consult with the Board. And we did via a letter with the Board.

But basically, this particular recommendation which seeks to make an amendment to the contract is related to Article VII, Section 7.1 (a) which is on the screen right now. And basically, the point of that section which we seek [two] changes where it says, “The relevant policies under which the changes are made shall be noted within each monthly report.”

And when we did review all the material that we used to make the review, we noticed that there was no policy per se that PTI uses to make changes like when a manager from a gTLD or ccTLD would like to make a change in the contact, for example, or the name of who the contact is, and things like that.

And so, we went back and interviewed the customers of PTI and PTI management itself and noticed that they've had a challenge with this contract wording because there was no policy that they could reference each time such a change is made.

So, we recommended that this be removed because it adds no value and it was simply copied from the previous contract that PTI had with the U.S. government. So that's, in a nutshell, what this is about. So, the ccNSO Council submitted its support for this, and this GNSO Council is the last one we're waiting for before the Board makes a decision. Thanks. Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much, Tomslin, for this very useful insight. So basically, I will sum it up here. The wait is almost over. The GNSO Council is going to

---

vote on this in a couple of days, and basically we are removing something that is not practical anymore, that's not operationally practical.

And I will pause here and, first of all, I would like to bring your attention to Herb's Ombudsman announcement on the chat. So, please bear this in mind that there are drop-in virtual Zoom office hours of the ombudsman.

And secondly, I will pause here and will ask if you have any questions about the agenda item #4. If you do, please either type them on the chat or raise your hand to speak. And seeing no hands for now, I am going to move to the agenda item #5. Maryam, if you can scroll down a bit.

So, the agenda item #5 is the vote on the charter for the Transfer Policy PDP, and we have only 10 minutes' discussion on this on the GNSO Council, although I can easily imagine that it might take a longer time. Maybe you remember from our last policy committee meeting that there was a question why the GNSO Council first approved the launch of the policy process on the Transfer Policy PDP. And only then, in February, we approved it. And then in March we're voting for the charter.

But apparently, this is right now a very high priority issue that GNSO was trying to take seriously and speed up. I personally do not see any problems with this charter. However, there still might be a contentious issue with the composition of this group. It was discussed at the GNSO Council that the Contracted Party House would probably like to send more people there because there are registries and registrars who might be bigger, who might be smaller.

---

So, there would be that would be 10 representatives from the Contracted Party House, I think. Yes. So, sorry. For Registrar Stakeholder Group, there would be 10 members and 10 alternates on this policy development process while Registries Stakeholder Group will have only 3.

This was done, the opportunity to participate in this member-based group was increased for registrars because it was recognized that they're not a homogenous group. They might have small enterprises, bigger enterprises. They might have geographical diversity, and so on and so forth.

And I'm not super comfortable with the balance of the other parts. For example, IPC, BC, and ISPCP will each have two members and two alternates. And CSG will have two members and two alternates. However, I asked in the charter to put the phrase that this does not create a precedent for composition of any future PDP.

Bear in mind that we are not going to send many people there. We have a shortage of members who can actually serve there. So, at least in terms of precedent, whether these can be taken as an example for further compositions, this issue is solved.

Another issue is that GAC and ALAC came back to the charter drafting team quite late in time, and each of them asked for three members. The Charter Drafting Working Group disagreed with this and agreed that both GAC and ALAC will have two members and two alternates.

---

So, we are going to see how the discussion goes. I do hope that this PDP charter will be approved because, for us, I do not see any danger here. However, we will see how it goes.

Yeah. Milton, I see your comment in the chat that the precedent was already set with EPDP, but I would say that with EPDP we had ... Yeah. There was, of course, some sort of argument there, but don't we have the same amount of people? No, we don't. Right? We have four members and two alternates. I don't remember anymore.

Milton, please go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER:

Well, the issue is not so much how many representatives we have. The issue is that they continue to represent these different constituencies in the Commercial Stakeholder Group as, in effect, the equivalent of an entire stakeholder group in terms of how the consensus is determined within the working group. And I think it is becoming a precedent, and it's something that's very bad. Although I guess the Council, ultimately, is represented the way it is. But it really is unfair to give effect ...

Each of these are constituencies within a stakeholder group, so it would be like having separate NPOC/NCUC representatives on a committee on a working group. And, just, is the unit the stakeholder group, or is it something else? It should be the stakeholder group because that's how things are structured in the GNSO. And they keep deviating from that simply in order to magnify the representation of the Commercial Stakeholder Groups.

---

TATIANA TROPINA:

Stephanie, before I will give you the floor, Milton, I very much agree with you. I remember how much we argued during the charter drafting for the EPDP because, at the beginning, they had the same number of representatives for each of the constituencies in the stakeholder group as we had on the NCSG. And I remember myself exploding and asking, “What kind of math is this?”

It's actually secondary school or maybe primary school math, how many people you can have. So, the math was bad and, apparently, it is still not working quite well. And I do believe that, perhaps at some point, we will have to reconsider and see the balance here because, on the one hand, when you have restricted representation, you cannot populate the group with more business representatives and so on and so forth who would be very active. So, it works for us in a way. But still, in a way it doesn't.

Stephanie, please, you're the next.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes. I agree with the concerns that you and Milton have been expressing. We clearly don't have the person power to staff this this, as near as I can tell. And I do worry that this sets a precedent. I possibly worry too much, but I don't like that they even had the nerve to come forward and ask for three members. GAC and ALAC get several kicks at this can. And while we might think the Transfer Policy is not important, it is.

Now, in terms of the contracted parties having more members, it is, after all, basically their competitive arrangement that we're talking about here. I have no problem with them having a diversity of members. I would have a problem, in fact, if they didn't. But I don't.



---

I worry when these other organizations, namely GAC and ALAC, are having more members there than we have because, quite frankly, their members tend to be representing GAC interests. And we have a long history of having to push back on GAC interests. What the precise GAC interests are on this particular question, on this particular group, I don't know. I haven't read up on it enough, but it may be data retention which is a primary concern for us in my opinion. Thanks. Sorry to repeat what others have said.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much, Stephanie. And the only comment I can make here is that, indeed, they did ask for three representatives. But the Charter Drafting Team decided to give them only two, although the ask itself ... And the thought of it has to be considered.

This has been my constant worry since quite a few years, but every time when I was trying to speak about them, the GNSO Council people got angry and sometimes looked at me like I just landed from Mars. So, I felt like, well, perhaps my concerns have not been shared by many.

Stephanie, I guess this is an old hand. And Kathy, you're the next.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Hi, Tatiana. Can you hear me?

TATIANA TROPINA:

Yes, loud and clear.

---

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay, great. Hi, everybody. So, I'm really glad that you're pushing back. And thanks so much.

I just wanted to add an observation about ALAC, which is that they seem to be the retirement home for BC and IPC. So, Jonathan Zuck was one of the heads of the Commercial Stakeholder Group. Greg Shatan was the head of the Intellectual Property Constituency. I think they were both presidents of their stakeholder groups.

So, just a quick note, as you look at the counts, to maybe keep that in mind. Thanks so much.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah. This is absolutely so. And while I have nothing against them personally, I do think that this is a bit of a forum shopping where you can get your point across and through. But I think that there is very little that we can do about it. People are free, and we'll always advocating for freedoms. Right?

So, everybody is free to join ALAC, [inaudible] see Milton and Kathy there [inaudible] if they decide to retire from NCSG. I know I'm making very bad jokes just to sail through this session. So, trying to entertain you guys. Trying to entertain how many people we have on the call. 34 participants. Hello, everyone.

Tomslin, you're the next in the queue.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Tatiana. I am very entertained. I just wanted to make a comment on the issue of participation for NCSG and if there are members on the

---

call who are looking to participate in that. But I'm not sure what it entails and why they should. There is a session at 2:30 concurrent time, so that's about four hours away. That will discuss this PDP charter and why the PDP is being chartered in the first place, or initiated a bit more. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much, Tomslin. I also thank you so much for taking—how to say—these duties, taking over this task to speak on that panel about this PDP.

So, I think that we actually spent more time discussing this charter for the Transfer Policy than is going to be spent on it on the GNSO Council. So, as you can see, the agenda is indeed full.

Tomslin, is it an old hand? Because if there are no more comments, I will move to the agenda item #6. If Maryam or whoever can move down a bit.

So, it is going to be the Council discussion with Nominating Committee Outreach Subcommittee Outreach. Sorry, I'm reading from the agenda and it makes very little sense to read the title.

So, okay. Nominating Committee Outreach Subcommittee Outreach. So, the Nominating Committee will reach out to the GNSO Council about the leadership positions which are being open now for the application. For all of you, if you consider applying, please do. As far as I understand, the deadline is on the 29<sup>th</sup> of March. So, please get your application together and submit it.

And we are not going to focus on this agenda item for long. We are going to the agenda item #7 which is going to be the Council discussion on the

---

status update regarding the EPDP Phase 2A. And as you can see, the time reserved for this agenda item is 20 minutes, although I think that this can easily go over time.

The underlying notion behind this discussion that when the EPDP Phase 2 was launched, it was agreed that we cannot have, how to say, EPDPs that just go and go and go, and never finish. Right? Ever running. It's not an Expected Policy Development Process anymore. It's just never-ending policy development process and PDP.

However, while the Council recognized the necessity to consider these issues which might not be given enough attention in the EPDP Phase 2, there was a discussion that there should be a hard stop at some point. So, if it's clear that the group is not going to reach consensus, the GNSO Council is going to put brakes on it and say, "Okay, it's finished."

And we are going to hear from Keith Drazek who is the EPDP Phase 2A chair and from Philippe Fouquart who is the GNSO Council chair, and also liaison to the EPDP Phase 2A, to determine whether the progress has been made and whether there is a chance that the EPDP Phase 2A is going to reach consensus.

And I will pause here, and maybe we can hear from somebody from EPDP 2A. And I'm looking at you, Milton, and I'm pointing my finger at you. Do you want to jump in and update us a bit or maybe provide some of your thoughts about this?

MILTON MUELLER:

Okay. First, as a disclaimer, let me warn you that I'm really bad at procedural things. I'm pretty conversant on the policy issues, but in terms

---

of the formal designation of what constitutes progress and what procedures are involved, I'm pretty bad. So, maybe you can have somebody else about that.

But my understanding is that Phase 2A is basically those issues when, in the first EPDP, we kicked the can down the road because there was no consensus. And the issues that I understand that we're involved with are 1) the legal/natural distinction, 2) the question of what kind of a contact method is established in the open public record of the registration.

So, on the starting with the open public, contact method, we have a demand from what we lovingly call ... I'm just saying that because Herb is here. We love them and we call them the surveillance caucus just as a form of shorthand. And we are totally being within the expected standards of conduct by saying that because it's accurate.

So, they wanted sort of a standardized, but they called it anonymized, e-mail address that they could use to contact redacted people that would be the same for every person over all registration which, of course, would mean that it would almost be a unique identifier for anybody and therefore would not be anonymized at all. And we, of course, said, "Well, if you're going to have an e-mail address, it has to be separate for every registration."

And of course, the registrars are happy with their current system of using a web form, and the Intellectual Property Constituency is not happy with that because they feel like they're too restrictive and they cannot contact people and send them attachments, namely legal demand notes or things like that.

---

So, I think that issue is fairly headed towards resolution in a way that we would like to see it resolved. I think everybody realizes that a so-called anonymized e-mail address that is the same for all your registrations is, in effect, an identifier that would not be something that would shield the identity of the registrant very well. But still, they're kicking around these questions in the legal committee. And maybe when Stephanie talks, she can give us more information about how the legal committee is handling that question.

A more sticky question is one of legal/natural distinction. So, the default position that emerged out of the first phase was that we would leave it up to the registrars to decide whether and how they would make a distinction between legal and natural. And on this issue, I think that we clearly don't want to force all registrants to declare whether they are legal or natural and then have the registrars forced to do some kind of a verification process which would make registration extremely expensive and complicated.

And, of course, we know that the surveillance caucus wants to make these legal persons openly available on the Internet because that would maybe open up at least half, maybe more, of the records and bring them back into the old open WHOIS format. So, we have already agreed that registrants who want to publish their WHOIS data can do so by providing consent. And that is legally complicated, providing consent, as I'm sure some of you lawyers know under the GDPR.

But, in effect, there may be room for a compromise here, and there may be room for progress. Or there may not be. I have been exploring the space for a compromise, promoting the idea that maybe there is a

---

checkbox that you can offer people and say, “Are you a legal person or a natural person?” And if they check that box, then there would be some form of easier access.

For example, maybe automated disclosure under the SSAD, Standardized System for Access and Disclosure. And the reason I’m willing to try to meet somebody halfway on this issue ... And I would warn you that there are other people in NCUC who are not.

But I am concerned about the ongoing high-level negotiations in the European Commission, in particular, about the NIS 2 and the various forms of lobbying that are going on at the European Commission, direct discussions between ICANN Org and the European Commission and the U.S. government about this question of legal/natural.

People can argue legitimately that legal person data would not be protected by GDPR and therefore should be outside of the scope of protection. Of course, we counter in return that making this distinction is difficult for individual registrants. And some home offices or certain kinds of legal persons might have lots of personal data or sensitive data about themselves in the registration records, so we don't think it's a simple matter.

And then the process of verifying and legally determining who is a legal person and who isn't could complicate the process of registration and make it more expensive.

ow let me just have a check here. Am I going on too long?

---

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes and no, because other, I'm sorry, other agenda items can be shortened in our discussion because they don't see us directly.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. Well, I don't have a lot more to say except that, essentially, I'm opening up the discussion as to whether there should be an attempt to arrive at some kind of compromise that throws a bone to the people who want more liberal access to legal person data, registration data; or whether we should stick with the Phase 1 finding.

My concern is that, again, if we stick with the Phase 1 finding and say, "Oh, we've won," then the other half of the EPDP—that means GAC, Commercial Stakeholder Group, SSAC, ALAC—they will continue lobbying for some kind of bypass or extraneous modification of the ICANN policy determination. And this will all be going on outside of the EPDP process.

So, if we can do something to satisfy these people in the EPDP process and get it over with, that may be a false hope but I'm thinking we need to explore that possibility. So, that's it for me.

TATIANA TROPINA: So, Milton, to sum it up, if we are discussing the progress made at the EPDP Phase 2A, we're better to advocate for extending it and saying that there is a possibility to reach consensus. Because I know that some people are rather militant about the progress of the Phase 2A. So, we can safely say that we don't have a problem to extend. Right?

MILTON MUELLER: I think that would be my position, as much as I hate to extend it.



---

TATIANA TROPINA: Okay, good.

MILTON MUELLER: But I'm pretty sure that that's not the position of other people in NCSG.

TATIANA TROPINA: Okay. So, before I go to Stephanie. Tomslin, I saw that your hand was up.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Tatiana. At the time, I wanted to say we have an agenda item on this topic to discuss it in more detail, but now that Milton has given the updating the data], I think it's only fair that the rest of the team also comments. We could assume. We could assume that that agenda item is discussed already, then. So, we'll use the time.

TATIANA TROPINA: Oh, great. So, let me go to Stephanie then. Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, hi. I have a different view. I believe that our stakeholders are the non-commercial name holders. And given the increasing prevalence of working from home, of entrepreneurs who are in the gig economy who are working from home in many cases, it is more important than it ever was to protect in this murky area of what's a legal person and what isn't.

Just in Canada, whether you are a business or not—whether you file as a business in your taxes—that's all determined at the provincial level.

---

Sometimes, whether you're a business or not is determined at the municipality level. Canada is not alone in that. You will find a mix across Africa, for instance, in businesses. And you will also see a lot of home-based business.

So, I do worry. It's a very complex area. I spend more of my pro bono time volunteering as a privacy consultant to help NGOs, and pretty substantial ones, to navigate this turf. And it's hard. And I'm not a lawyer, but I work with very competent lawyers and they have a hard time. So, to throw it open with a tick box and ask our people ...

And I mean no disrespect. I understand that Milton's operating from a good place. We're trying to be cooperative. But we've already been cooperative. Remember how long this has been going on, and we threw a bone to even open this up again. We have good language that we got in Phase 1. It is the liability of the contracted parties whether or not their explanations of whether you're a legal person and how to decide will pass the test.

But it is our people who are going to either pass or fail on that test. Forget whether the contracted parties wind up paying fines or not. That's not my concern. My concern is for individual operators, for female entrepreneurs who are going to have their data exposed and be stalked and whatever, dissidents. We also represent free speech organizations.

And increasingly, in Canada our public health authorities are getting stalked and having death threats. So, we sure as heck don't want political speakers to be running risks. So, that's kind of ...

---

I see no reason to concede on this. Being ex-government, I understand the lobbying that's going on. I maintain that it's going to go on anyway. People have been talking about ... Well, I won't use the expression I would use. "To heck with you, we're going to legislate." That's been going on for years. "Take away our free WHOIS? We're going to legislate."

So, that's been going on. The European Union, I think, will have a very difficult time justifying this. If they do decide to pass a regulation that exposes individuals in their domestic homes, then there will be a case taken to the court in Europe and it'll be thrown out.

So, I don't see any point in conceding at ICANN when we know they still would prefer law. So, that's kind of how I feel about this, and I do feel very strongly. I think we have a duty to protect our people who are not going to be able to navigate the distinction between legal and natural.

Thanks. I've got lots more to say, but I'll defer and hand the floor over to Kathy.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you, Stephanie. And, indeed, it was a blurring border between legal and natural when it comes to small one-person businesses. It's really hard to see the distinction.

I will give the floor to Kathy now, but bear in mind that we have 50 minutes left and we also have to go through policy process and public comments and the Board meeting for tomorrow.

I will close the queue with Kathy here, and we will move further. Kathy, the floor is yours.

---

KATHY KLEIMAN: Okay. So, I'm going to open with a question for Milton. Milton, I just want to make sure he's ... Hi. Question for you. Are we talking about a black and white question that says, "Are you a legal person or are you a natural person"?

KATHY KLEIMAN: I thought that's what we have now, opt-in consent.

MILTON MUELLER: No, we don't. We have something very different which is you're going through a formal GDPR-defined consent process that says, "I am an individual and I'm okay to let you publish my data."

MILTON MUELLER: I am saying that we might actually do both sides of this debate a favor by having a checkbox like that and making it clear that if you check it, your data will be published. And then having no authorization or any kind of check up on which one you are. It's simply giving them the option to declare that they're a legal person and they want their data published or they're okay with having their data published.

But let's suppose they're illegal person and they don't. Then they don't check the box and the data doesn't get exposed. To me, this releases the pressure to have this distinction without sacrificing really very much.

---

KATHY KLEIMAN: So, a clarifying question. I'm a Planned Parenthood organization and I do not publicize my location because I'm tired of being protested and worse. I'm tired of my patients being blocked. I'm a legal organization, though. I can't get insurance if I'm not.

But you ask me a question that says, "Are you legal or are you natural?" And if I don't answer it, am I deemed to have lied, basically? Am I deemed to have admitted or said that I'm a natural person and therefore lied? I mean, basically, can I be sued?

MILTON MUELLER: That would not happen. The latter part would not happen. There would be no, essentially ... In my proposal, at least in my understanding of what I'd like to see happen, there would be no, "Oh, you're going to be legally bound to this statement." It's simply sort of like, "Hey, if you're a corporation or a company and you don't mind having your data published, check this box."

KATHY KLEIMAN: Interesting. Okay. Well, if we have anything that says that I'm a legal person or a natural person, we're going to trap legal persons. I thought it was [that] if you're Facebook, you can opt in and say, "I'm Facebook. I want to publish all my data all the time," because Susan had been asking for that for so many years.

I wanted to share—gosh, I think [inaudible]—historically what we've done on this issue which is that NCUC and then NCSG have been very, very concerned about the blurred line between, as Stephanie mentioned

---

a little bit, legal persons and natural persons. And that line has gotten so much blurrier in the last 20 years that we've been working on this.

So, I have kathykleiman.com. It is a .com. I use it for everything. Am I a legal person? Am I a natural person? It's a little hard. I'm certainly a natural person. But if you're doing anything commercial, you're going to have that question, "Have you become a legal person?" So, the question itself is difficult to answer, if it's a yes or no. If it's, "Am I a legal person and do I want my information published" that's a pretty ... That's a clear question.

But home offices are growing, and for years I posited that someone could be stalked out of the home office for having to ... Especially in places where post office boxes are either not available, which is many countries, or post office boxes are just all taken, which is many urban areas.

And I posited some that a woman could be stalked from her home office address, and somebody came up to me and said, "You don't have to make that theoretical anymore. I was stalked by my ex-husband, and the only place he could have found my home address was that I had to list"—in those days there was no [proxy] privacy—"I had to list my home office."

We have a lot of mom-owned businesses. A big thing here for our stakeholder group is nonprofits. In order to be a nonprofit 501(c)(3) in the United States, you must be incorporated, hence a legal person. Otherwise, you can't apply for the tax qualification. Many NGOs I know and non-commercials and nonprofits are groups that start as two or three individuals, often in a basement or garage of someone's home.

---

For years we've tried to protect their lives and the lives of their families because many of them are expatriates of whatever country. They're talking about the corruption, and their families would be arrested the next day. We've got basic privacy issues on this. Plus, it's just a confusing issue. There's no clear line under GDPR. And also, a lot of free speech and freedom of expression laws protect both individuals and small NGOs.

So, thanks for the time. Let me hand it back to Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much. And, Milton, you're the last one, and I'm going to put a hard stop there because we still have the GNSO agenda and the NCSG Policy Committee Meeting agenda. Please, [go ahead].

MILTON MUELLER:

Okay, so I'll try to be quick. So, the issue here is that this is like being presented as either we completely don't have any disclosure or we have all disclosure of all nonprofit borderline cases of legal person. Remember, what's going to happen if we do nothing—if we stick with the status quo—is that the registrars will be able to decide for themselves how they handle this distinction. And they could handle it in a way that's worse than what I'm proposing.

Now, it's true that you can shift registrars if you don't like that, but I am not entirely confident. I think I would rather have a clear, uniform description of what the registrants' rights are here than just leaving it up to the registrars. But all of the things that Kathy mentioned, I am very aware of that. Those are problems. Those are things we need to take into account.

---

And all I'm trying to do is find a way in which people who have no problem with being designated as a legal person and no problem with their data being published, consequently—we can implement a lightweight mechanism for letting them do that. And somehow, we would have to convey, for that to work, the idea that if you are a legal person or you're confused about that, you shouldn't check that box if you think that you don't want your data disclosed.

And that is not easy. I realize there are risks in that. I'm just saying that maybe there's space for a compromise here that would relieve a lot of the pressure around this issue.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you, Milton. I see that Stephanie's hand is up. I just, yeah. I'm torn apart here because I do like this discussion and I do think that many of our members can absolutely relate to this.

So, I'll ask Tomslin. Tomslin, if I give the floor to Stephanie, can we shorten the agenda somehow later because we still have to reserve the last 10 minutes of this meeting for the Board discussion preparation tomorrow. I'm going to go through agenda items—so, the GNSO meeting 8 through 12 like “swoosh”, but how many minutes do we have left for the Council agenda?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Tatiana. I think we could take some time out of the NCSG meeting to discuss a bit of this as well.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Okay.



---

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Just so that we can complete the agenda item for today.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes. So, I think that perhaps it's better if we move this discussion also to the NCSG Open Meeting. Bruna, what do you think?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Yes. I suggested that in the chat. So, if we can do this tomorrow, I can reshape the ... I can move things around at our agenda and do the most relevant discussion. Let me just check the time, Milton. It's at the same slot as today's meeting, so from 15:00? Is it? No. Yeah, 15:30 to 17:00.

TATIANA TROPINA: Is it the meeting with the Board or our meeting?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: No, the ... Oh, I'm so sorry, guys. Yeah. I'm looking at the wrong time. Yeah. It's on Wednesday [and it's] a [inaudible] open meeting. It's only Wednesday, but it's also at the same slots from 12:30 to 14:00 my time, which means 15:30 to 17:00 UTC.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: It's on Thursday.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: It's on Wednesday.

---

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Before our Council meeting.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: It's on Wednesday before the Council, yeah.

TATIANA TROPINA: So, I'm sorry. I don't understand who says what anymore because people don't state their names. Kathy, I do hope that this is an old hand. Bruna, do you have anything to add?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Just to clarify this. NCSG Open Meeting is on Wednesday from 15:00 UTC. Yeah. I just need to check the times, but I'll type it on the chat. And I have also sent it to the list last week. So, if we can make it on Wednesday, I can definitely reshape the agenda just so we can fit these discussions.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Bruna. Stephanie, I will give you only one minute because everything is going to be moved there. So, if anything you want to wrap up with, please go ahead. But otherwise, I will continue with the GNSO agenda.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Just a very quick point. We haven't mentioned that in some jurisdictions, employees have rights. And due to the way that registrations are generally handled and automatically renewed, there is a possibility that

---

a contact would go to a new employee in a jurisdiction that has employee rights. And that is a risk, particularly given that abuse would go to a security person and security people are frequently working from home as contractors, you have exposed someone there. I'm typing in the chat as well, thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you, Stephanie. And Milton, I will not give you the floor to answer this common because ...

Bruna is it an old hand, I assume? Stephanie, is it an old hand? Because I closed the queue and we are going to move to the GNSO Council meeting agenda item #8. If Maryam can please scroll down to the #8. Thank you very much.

So, I'm going to cover this quite quickly, I hope. So, we will have the Council update from the EPDP Phase 1 Recommendation 27. I guess it would be how the Implementation Review Team is working on this. And this is about the privacy and proxy. So, this is accreditation issues.

And I'm sure that there's a lot for us to speak about this, and I'm sure that Stephanie has something to say about this. But this is just the Council update, so we will just receive an update, introduction of the topic, and a bit of Council discussion. So, I will not open this topic for our meeting for now as it is only the update.

And we are going to move to the agenda item #9 which is much more contentious. And this is the debrief on the consultation with the ICANN Board on the financial sustainability of the SSAD. And there has been quite an exchange of correspondence between the Board and the GNSO

---

Council. And there were a couple of meetings about this, and we're still not clear whether the financial ...

It is still not clear for us whether the financial sustainability and financial analysis of the SSAD, of the feasibility, would be the part of this operational design phase. Or would it be an additional analysis that the Board is going to do? And then, what is the role of the GNSO in this entire process?

Because somehow confusingly, during the last meeting with the Board, it looked like the Board said, "Yes, we are going to perform this analysis, but then we'll leave it up to GNSO to decide if you still want to approve this recommendation."

The GNSO Council, particular me and Pam Little and some others, expressed concerns about this because we do consider this to be a fiduciary duty of the Board, both the analysis and the decision. However, for now—and, Stephanie, correct me if I'm wrong—the GNSO Council stands at the position [then].

Though it is not clear for us, still, whether the financial sustainability analysis of the SSAD is going to be a part of the ODP or not (Operational Design Phase). We still want the board to get back to the GNSO if they decide not to approve it because their fiduciary duty says that the cost benefit analysis is not good.

So, the GNSO is going to look at the recommendations, yet again, and perhaps get them back to the EPDP which we hope will not happen, but still.

---

I have nothing to add here because it is still unclear. We are currently drafting yet another letter to the Board about this. Hopefully, it's going to be sent soon. But at least we know that ... The only thing we know is that the Board is indeed going to perform the analysis. And the GNSO Council wants ... If the decision is negative about this analysis, as a result of this analysis, we want to be consulted upon this.

And I will stop here. Milton, yes.

MILTON MUELLER:

So, I'm curious that the ... I know that the resistance to the SSAD has come from the surveillance caucus, from the people who particularly ... Actually, not the entire caucus, but from the intellectual property interests, in particular. And I'm wondering if this pulling back from the commitment to do the SSAD is also coming from the contracted parties, in your opinion.

TATIANA TROPINA:

I have no opinion on this. I don't think that pulling back ... For my impression, I don't think that this is coming from the contracted parties. I do understand, however, that if those who asked for this system are not going to use it, what is the point?

MILTON MUELLER:

Well, that's the question. I think that's the interesting question here. What exactly do they want? They want it without paying for it, is what I suspect. But I think we need to call their bluff on this and just move ahead

---

with the SSAD. And I think that this business of doing more studies is kind of a stalling tactic that we should not be participating or encouraging.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Milton, I think that the horse is indeed already out of the barn because, in a way, it is a fiduciary duty of the Board to determine the cost benefit of this system. And the GNSO Council already approved this recommendation, so it is not really what we decide, what we can block. The Board has already decided to do this, and there is very little we can do except just be diligent and see how the process is going. There is no way to stop what's going on here right now already. I'm sorry. I'm not very positive on this, but it is what it is.

Oh, my God. I see the queue is forming. So, Stephanie, you're the next. Then we have Bruna ... No, wait. Yeah. Stephanie, you're the next. Then Bruna and then Ron. Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes. Just a key point that I feel is important here is that we should have had a cost analysis, some of a financial feasibility estimate, at the beginning of the EPDP. We've been building a white elephant that we may not be able to afford, and we haven't been able to get the money to do that analysis. It's a bit like not being able to get legal counsel until three-quarters of the way through Phase 1.

So, it is irritating to see that after all this work, now there will be a financial feasibility study done by the Board. I certainly agree that the Board has the fiduciary responsibility to look after the organization, but

---

the Board hasn't been transparent at all about its own liability as a co-controller from the get-go.

While we speak about this, the negotiation over the contracts and the co-controller arrangements are going on in private. And we don't know. We asked the Board point blank, and Göran, “Where do you see ICANN in this?”

Now, if ICANN runs this thing and does the contract, one of the things they're also assessing is their own financial liability. I have a concern about it being solely within this operational design phase module that the Board controls because it directly impacts policy, these are.

We're back to this picket fence nonsense that has haunted WHOIS and the registrars' contracts for decades. What does the policy have a right to look at? And it certainly has a right to know where ICANN stands as a co-controller and what it proposes to operate and set policy for.

So, as you can tell, I'm good for hours on this. So, yeah, the horse is out of the barn, but I think we need to guard the role of the GNSO both in membership and having all of the GAC and the ALAC. And not to mention the SSAC. I keep leaving them out. The advisory councils have enormous lobbying power and several kicks of the can here, and they will be discussing how to build this during this operational design phase. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you, Stephanie. And, indeed, notes taken. And I do think that ... Actually, I do think the Board goes to the Council recognizing its primary role in all this. But let's see how it will go.

---

So, Bruna, you are the next.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks, Tatiana. I'm going to be really quick here, but you guys might remember that back in February [there] was sent a letter to the Board and ICANN CEO as well. And we had some questions about who would be the subject of the term, the "signee" of the SSAD, as well as some other clearance with regards to process.

And I'm just taking the time just to read one part of this letter from Goran which was that, "In order to facilitate the Board's careful review and consideration of important EPDP Phase 2 recommendations, the Board has asked for this operational design assessment, and also SSAD-related recommendations from the final report."

And just one point that would be just to say ... At least what's written on the letter says that the assessment will include what is needed for not only the financial part, but operational readiness systems and tools, resources, and staffing, to name a few of the things they want to address as part of this ODP.

But I guess Ron that has his hand up can clarify even further this point.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes. Thank you very much. Ron, thanks for raising your hand. Please, please go ahead.



---

RON DA SILVA:

Happy to jump in. First of all, I'm delighted to be here. I always enjoy spending time with the non-commercial side of the house. The issues you raise and the topics that are dear to you, I always find affinity to and thus enjoy the opportunity that I have to be with you.

But listening in, a lot of questions about process. And I think all the concerns being raised or a great reflection on this particular topic—how lack of uniformity we have across the entire community, about what we should do and how we should do it and what the scope should be, and what is reasonable and what's not reasonable—is a great example of where, instead of having consensus that reflects everybody, we have sort of a majority point of view that was driven forward and put into a policy recommendation.

And now, procedurally, the Board is obligated to implement that. And I think it's in our financial responsibility to understand what the costs are before we say, "Go execute," because we also need to figure out how do we fund those and where does it align with other priorities.

So, that's sort of an important piece in the process. This whole ODP function that's kind of a new thing that the Board and the Org is implementing, I think, is a good step from a fiduciary standpoint to understand before we say, "Go do something," that we understand what the scope and costs and schedule and impact is with other projects. So that, I think, is important.

But notwithstanding, to me, I see a lot of issues around ... Regardless of what comes back from the ODP or the implementation, namely that—whether it's from the GAC or the ALAC or from the SSAC—there are concerns still being raised. And there's still, even within the GNSO,

---

concerns that are being raised. So, there isn't like this uniform position of this, "This is a good thing. Let's go do it."

So, I find it very challenging and problematic to just move ahead blindly full steam. To this is an important first step, getting the ODP to understand what the costs and the scope.

I do hear the concern [that] this is going to be some big monolithic system that's going to have a lot of cost implications, and those costs are going to be pushed back on to the users in some sort of fee. And if that fee is too high and the cost reclamation process, the economics, just don't make sense, then nobody's going to use it and we're going to waste all this money on a system that doesn't get used. Those are all valid arguments we need to sort through.

I don't have all the answers, and I think it's fair to say the Board doesn't have all the answers. Right? And that's why we're asking the staff to go execute this ODP so at least we can get one more piece of information to weigh in on how we implement this and what does it mean. But, yeah, everything that you're raising here, we're wrestling with those same questions. There are a lot of different opposing and competing perspectives on what the SSAD is and how it should be used and who it benefits.

Thought I'd chime in. Again, glad to be here.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much, Ron, for providing the Board perspective on this. And we certainly can understand this as well.

---

Everyone, bearing in mind that we have only 26 minutes left, I'm not accepting any comments on the GNSO agenda. I'm not accepting any discussions anymore. This has been probably one of the most interesting meetings of our policy committee in months, but this also reflects the fact that the agenda of the GNSO is packed, packed, packed.

So, I'm going to go through the last three agenda item in bulk. [inaudible] to me, to give it finally back to Tomlin and Bruna. Thanks to everyone who participated. Just, you know, time flies.

So, Maryam, if we can go now to the agenda item #10 number first. But maybe we can just reduce the scale and have all three on the screen. So, the item #10 is related to this discussion of scoping the accuracy issue for the purpose of launching a PDP on accuracy.

This is yet another child of the EPDP Phase 2. And there would be discussion on the briefing paper which is coming from GDS, so please do attend the Council meeting or read the paper if you want to know what this is about.

The item#11 would be Council discussion on the consideration of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee comments to the new GAC Subsequent Procedures Report. They did submit the comments to the ICANN Board outlining their concerns about the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Draft Final Report which can relate to security, stability and resiliency of the DNS. But also, DNS abuses come in there, specifically.

---

No time for us to discuss it, but then again it is a continuous discussion and we do not have any influence on the process on how they send the comments. So, this is just an update.

And finally, the item #12 is the framework for continuous improvement. So, this framework has been developed currently. And so, Maryam, if we can scroll down to the agenda item #12.

So, this framework has been developed to address procedural structural issues of how GNSO is actually doing its work and how we cope with everything that is in front of us in addition to PDPs. For example, how do we implement Work Stream 2? How we work on other issues.

So, these framework is going to be introduced by the Council, but also, as far as I know, the stakeholder groups and constituencies involved as well. So, this is a work in progress.

And we will have open microphone for Any Other Business, item #13. And with this, I'm sorry for not accepting any questions anymore, any comments. You can put them on the chat. But we are completely running out of time.

So, Bruna and Tomslin, back to you. And, sorry. It was interesting, but it took a bit longer than I planned. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Tatiana. And thanks for that update. That was very contentious. So, we will move on to our agenda item #2 which is policy updates. But I'll comment that one of the updates that we were meant

---

to have, which was the EPDP Phase 2A, I believe we have had it for this meeting and will continue in the NCSG meeting on Wednesday.

The other policy that we will be having is on the IGO Work Track, and I saw Ioana and Juan on the call, so I'll pass it on to one of you to please tell us what that is. I'll leave it to you to explain what the work track is up to.

IOANA STUPARIU: Hi, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Hi.

IOANA STUPARIU: Hi, Tomslin. Thank you for giving us the floor, and thank you for the extensive presentation of what's happening with the GNSO Council. Very interesting. As Bruna has said, I think—or Tatiana—this was one of the most interesting sessions, at least for us from the outside, to watch. So, thanks for that.

Since I know we are very much pressed by time, I'm going to be very brief because this working group is very at the beginning, to say so, so just let me briefly give you a bit of an overview of what this is about.

This is IGO working group, Intergovernmental Organization Work Track. And this follows a work that has happened in April 2019 when the GNSO Council has approved four out of the five Policy Development Process

---

recommendations from another working group that has happened—the IGO/INGO Access to Curative Rights PDP Working Group.

But there was one recommendation that was left out because the GNSO thought that it might pose some problems to the rights of IGOs. So, basically this entire working group is about the fifth recommendation, the one that has not been adopted as of today. Basically, this is the scope of our work to analyze this fifth recommendation, see whether it can be reconciled with the other four recommendations that have already been approved, and see whether we can make it acceptable for approval. And there are lots of limitations that we have.

I'm not going to go too much into detail. Juan can also jump in and my colleagues can also jump in.

Just to give an overview. We've had, so far, four meetings because we just started the discussions. The majority of the meetings so far have been about the scope of this working track because there's been proposals to extend the scope and the mandate that we received, and to extend discussions on the other four recommendations, not to stick to this one.

In the end, we agreed, after many discussions, that we are going to stay to this fifth recommendation and work as if the other four that have been approved are given and we cannot really discuss or proposal modifications to them.

And we've also prepared the work plan for our regular meetings because we had four meetings as a deadline to suggest work meetings. And we are going to meet on a weekly basis to discuss this. There are two

---

procedural issues that will be discussed—on jurisdiction and on legal standing of IGOs.

I think where we are right now is that we have listed the potential legal solutions that could replace what's now into Recommendation 5. And right now in the next meetings, we are going to list pros and cons and see which one would work best so that it's legal, it comes in line with the other four recommendations, and it respects some basic rules, some boundaries that were given to us in this mandate such as the fact that we cannot recommend the creation of new specific dispute resolution procedures for the IGOs, that we cannot supplant the role of a court in determining the question of an IGO's immunity.

These are very highly technical legal questions about international standing of IGOs and about jurisdiction. So, there hasn't been any material progress because, basically, we just determined what we have to do until now.

And another relevant update on this is that we were three that were appointed to represent NCSG in this working group, but now it's just me and Juan because one of appointees has resigned from ICANN work all together. And maybe this is something that we should discuss, whether there should be a third person appointed to replace the third person that resigned in this working group.

I hope that I'm going to have more substantive updates as we move into actual debates. And, Juan, if you want to add anything to what I presented. I tried to be as brief as possible.

---

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: I think [that's] covering all of the four meetings in brief. I'm sorry [inaudible].

IOANA STUPARIU: Yeah. So, basically that's it. [inaudible] I hope in the next month or so, I think that we can bring more on to what are the sides there. But so far, we seem to have consensus on the scope and on the way in which we should approach this matter. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you. Thank you, Ioana. Thank you for the comprehensive, summarized update. Thanks.

I think we now will be moving to agenda #3 three which is the public comments that are currently open. And I think there are two main ones that are still open. The EPDP Phase 2 Policy Recommendation for Board consideration is open, and Stephanie is currently working on that. Stephanie, you mentioned you wanted to give an update on that. Or was that just referring to the PDP Phase 2A work all together?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks, Tomslin. I just wanted to give an outline of what I'm doing. Anybody who's tried to follow the EPDP work from the outside probably has discovered that it's a bit confusing. It's discombobulated. We did a public comment on the on the recommendations where there was agreement. We deferred the public comment on the recommendations where there was less agreement. That's what we're responding to now.



---

But I think it rather behooves us. We had a fairly short one-and-a-half page comment the last time. I think it behooves us this time to look at the recommendations and give a broader sense of how we feel about this whole thing rather than just respond to questions about a recommendation.

So, that's what slowing me down. It might be fairly lengthy, and I realize we've only got about six or seven days left. So, believe me, I have a field of fire underneath me to get this thing written, but it's hard when you look ...

It's hard, even, for those on the committee to keep track of what we're doing and which ones have been amended and which haven't. I imagine it's difficult for our members to follow. So, that's ...

Don't be funny now, Milton. Yes, I'm making lengthy comments. But I think it's about time we did, and I think it's ... I'd like to raise some of these underlying issues about the changing nature of domain names, about the pressure from platforms to make it harder and harder for individual registrants to get a domain name, about the affordability issues. We get that one little thing on the financial sustainability of this thing.

We need to talk about some of those issues, I think. I think this is our last chance in that ... Well, I hope it's our bloody last chance because I don't want to join another PDP. And I think Milton and I might even agree on that. We don't want another lengthy PDP to fight over yet another thing. So, it's a last chance to put some things in the public record. Thanks.

---

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Stephanie. We'll be looking forward to it. Sorry, I didn't hear you say this, but when do you think we might have it for the committee to review?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I'm trying for one day, but I think two days is more realistic given how many meetings we've got in the next couple of days.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Okay. Thank you. The other one is the second Security, Stability and Resiliency Review Team Final Report which has been extended. The due date has been extended to April 8<sup>th</sup>, and we do not have anyone volunteering for that. And I believe there are some very, very contentious issues in the report that are worth commenting on. So, if there is anyone interested in taking that up, please let me know. It will be really nice to have us comment on this especially since the report, I think, proposed a community working group but decided not to name us as a suggested party to that working group.

The other two that are still running are the proposal for the Korean Root Zone Label Generation Rules second public comment and the initial report on the Third ccNSO Policy Development Process. These haven't been shared on the mailing list yet. I will share them, and if anyone is interested in commenting on this, please let me know as well.

So, that is what we have for the public comments, and I think that's it for that agenda item.

---

Our next agenda item, I believe, is ... Yes, Bruna. You had something to say about our meeting with the Board and other administrative items. Please, over to you.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thank you very much, Tomslin. So, this is just some short preparation for tomorrow's meeting with the Board. Our meeting is taking place at 14:00 UTC tomorrow. I would recommend that at least leadership attends this meeting. It is a really important one for us. It is an important opportunity to hear about some of the Board developments so far. So, I'm asking for everybody to attend.

But talking about the agenda ... And I understand it's going to be a lunch meeting for me as well, Milton, so [we're] going to be around here forever. So, we have a few questions drafted. The two first topics were the ones that I sent to the Board. And thanks, Stephanie and our Council members, for also helping me draft them.

So, the first one will be about the EPDP. We're talking a little bit about concerns for things we have [conceded] and tried to reach consensus, and possibilities of some parts of the community [inaudible] for questions [and so far].

And the just a practical question about what are the Board recommendations for us dealing with these sorts of relitigation processes that have been going around EPDP.

The three next questions will be around the pandemic and ICANN community. So, the first one will be around how much money has the Org saved in this past year, and also trying to understand where this money

---

has been redistributed. Something we're also asking about are the steps the Board thinks that can be taken for us to address community burnout and decreasing participation and whether or not the Org has conducted any assessments on community participation as well.

And then, just a practical question around vaccines and if we are dealing with a plan or if we will deal with a plan in the near future.

These are the questions that we have sent to the Board. Kathy has suggested, shortly after Maryam sent them, one about SubPro that reads, "Given that the Subsequent Procedures Working Group was unable to undertake the research to understand the impact of the 2016 bylaw changes, what research and work will the Board undertake on this issue?"

I am happy to maybe try to shift those questions around if you would like me to discuss less on pandemic effects, on the community, or anything else. I do believe we have maybe more policy issues that could be added to this agenda.

That's it for me. I'm opening the floor to anyone who wants to comment or volunteer for leading any of these discussions. So, that it. Thank you, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. I'm just checking the queue if there are any hands up for comments.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Yeah, [that's a good idea]. Yeah. It doesn't look like we have comments.

---

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: No one is keen.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Not really, yeah. Which means you, myself, and [Tatiana] are probably leading these discussions tomorrow if nobody else volunteers. So, yeah.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right. With no one raising any hands, that brings us to agenda item #4 for Any Other Business.

Oh, I see Stephanie's hand just came up. Stephanie, please.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I'd be happy to volunteer for the PDP relitigation question. It's one of the things that motivates me to hold our ground on conceding on that issue we just discussed.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Okay. Thank you very much, Stephanie. I'm taking your name for that.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Awesome. Does anyone have any other business to bring today?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Well, Tomslin. Just one last thing. I have been sending the agenda to the NCSG list. We have had a lot of meetings. We will no longer have two plenaries this week, so we'll follow the meeting agenda. We'll follow with

---

having only the PICs meeting about SubPros and PICs as well. And Kathy's the one representing us there.

Other than, we have, tomorrow, the NCUC open meeting. In the Board meeting on Wednesday, it's going to be NCSG's open meeting. This morning we had NPOC open meeting.

So, please take a look on the agenda and attend all of those meetings if you can. I know we're all juggling work and this meeting, actually. But it's really important that we show up and actually contribute to the discussions. And if anyone needs to clarify anything about the agenda or anything like that, please let me know and I can help.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Bruna. Stephanie, is that an old hand or a new one? I think you're on mute if you're speaking.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Old hand, sorry.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you. I don't see any other hands. And that is our last agenda item, so I guess that brings us to the end of the meeting. Thank you so much, everyone, for the very interesting meeting that we've had today.

And thank you, Tatiana and Bruna, for covering those items. And thank you for all the policy updates we got from the EPDP team and the IGO team. Thank you, everyone.

See you in the rest of ICANN70.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thank you very much, everyone, for attending the call. The meeting is now adjourned. You may stop the recording, please. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**